

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending with this Application. Claims 7, 12, 15-17 and 19-21 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicants first wish to thank the Examiner for stating in paragraph 7 of the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006, that Claims 12-14 would each be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, against Claim 1, which could be overcome, as stated by the Examiner in paragraph 2 of the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006, by removing the phrase "fiber cement" from the preamble. Applicants also thank the Examiner for further stating in paragraph 8 of the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006, that each of Claims 12, 13 and 14, include subject matter allowable because the prior art of record did not teach or fairly suggest the subject matter of each claim, including a method of bonding a fluorocarbon film to top and sides of a substrate (at the same time) using an adhesive wherein an adhesive on the top or sides includes a reactive isocyanate and a catalyst capable of catalyzing a reaction between the isocyanate and hydroxyl groups or a method of bonding a fluorocarbon film to the top and sides of a substrate (at the same time) using an adhesive wherein an adhesive is a hot melt polyurethane adhesive.

Applicants further wish to thank the Examiner for taking part in a brief telephone interview on February 15, 2007, in which the Examiner agreed that examination of Claim 18 on its merits was overlooked with the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006, and for further clarifying the allowable subject matter. With regards to Claim 18, the Examiner agreed to examine the

claim on its merits in a reply filed after final rejection and the Examiner further agreed to call Applicants' representative after the examination with the findings. With regards to the allowable subject matter, the Examiner clarified that each claim would be in allowable form if each were amended independently to include the subject matter of Claim 1, which is to be amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, by removing the phrase "fiber cement" from Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit with this reply amended Claims 1, 13, 14 and 18. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, by removing the phrase "fiber cement" from Claim 1, as suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 2 of the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006. Claim 1 has also been amended to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 12, as suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 7 of the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006. Claim 13 has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 7 of the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006. In brief, amended Claim 13 includes the allowable subject matter of the claim combined with the base claim, Claim 1, which has been amended as suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 2 of the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006, by removing the phrase "fiber cement." Claim 14 has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 7 of the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006. Amended Claim 14 includes the allowable subject matter of the claim combined with the base claim, Claim 1, which has been amended as suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 2 of the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006, by removing the phrase "fiber cement." Claim 18 has

been amended to overcome a potential rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, by removing the phrase "fiber cement," as suggested by the Examiner for Claim 1

Claim 18 is considered patentably distinct from the cited art. For example, Claim 18 is distinct from Ettore (alone or in combination with other references), because Ettore does not teach each and every element of amended Claim 18 and Ettore actually teaches away from the claimed invention. Ettore wraps a film around a substrate by sequentially wrapping the film around different surfaces of the substrate and by doing so provides an "encapsulation" of the substrate, requiring all sides of the substrate to be coated with an adhesive and a film. In addition, Ettore does not transfer the texture of the first surface through the film, but, instead rolls a texture on the surface. Moreover, Ettore does not teach or suggest that bonding occurs between hydroxyl functional groups of the first surface of the substrate and the first layer and second layer formed on the substrate. Accordingly, Ettore does not teach each and every element of amended Claim 18, does not teach amended Claim 18 on its whole and by teaching an entirely different method, Ettore teaches away from the claimed invention, which, therefore, means that Ettore cannot be logically combined with any other reference because there would be no suggestion or motivation to combine an entirely different method of Ettore with any other reference in order to provide amended Claim 18.

Claim 18 is also distinct from Simms (alone or in combination with other references), because Simms does not

teach each and every element of amended Claim 18 and Simms actually teaches away from the claimed invention. Simms unlike amended Claim 18, requires a polyvinyl fluoride film that must be chemically activated by an acid as well as by heat to adhere to a substrate. Once the film is in contact with the substrate, the polyvinyl fluoride film on the substrate is then rolled or pressed onto the substrate surface. In addition, Simms does not teach or suggest that bonding occurs between hydroxyl functional groups of the first surface of the substrate and the first layer and second layer formed on the substrate. Accordingly, Simms does not teach each and every element of amended Claim 18, does not teach amended Claim 18 on its whole and by teaching an entirely different method, Simms teaches away from the claimed invention, which, therefore, means that Simms cannot be logically combined with any other reference because there would be no suggestion or motivation to combine an entirely different method of Simms with any other reference in order to provide amended Claim 18.

Claims 2-6 and 8-11 are maintained with this reply to properly depend from amended Claim 1, now provided in allowable form in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Applicants submit that any amendments introduced with this reply introduce no new issues requiring further consideration and/or search because amended Claims 1, 13 and 14 include allowable subject matter in accordance with Examiner suggestions set forth in the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006. In addition, Claims 2-6 and 8-11 are now in allowable form because they have been made to depend from an allowable base claim. As such, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the claims set

Attorney No. HARD1.020DV1 (129843-1037)  
Customer No. 60148

AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL  
APPLICATION NO. 10/791,970

12

forth in the Listing of Claims beginning on page 3 of this paper.

Applicants further submit that the Amendment set forth herein is in compliance with the rules for submitting a reply after final rejection under 37 C.F.R 1.116. Accordingly, this reply only cancels claims, adopts examiner suggestions, complies with any requirement of form expressly set forth in the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006, and/or presents rejected claims in better form for consideration before appeal. Applicants reiterate that no new matter has been introduced with this reply and no new issues requiring further consideration and/or search have been introduced with the claims set forth herein.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the Application is in condition for allowance, and Applicants earnestly seek such allowance of Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-14 and 18. Should the Examiner have questions, comments, or suggestions in furtherance of the prosecution of this Application, please contact Applicants' representative at 214.999.4330. Applicants, through their representative, stand ready to conduct a telephone interview with the Examiner to review this Application if the Examiner believes that such an interview would assist in the advancement of this Application.

To the extent that any further fees are required during the pendency of this Application, including petition fees, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees, including, without limitation, any fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or 37 C.F.R. § 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 07-0153 of Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP and reference Attorney Docket No. 129843-1037. In the event that any additional time is needed for this filing, or any additional time in excess of that requested in a petition for an extension of time, please consider this a petition for an extension of time for any needed extension of time pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 or any other section or provision of Title 37. Applicants respectfully request that the Commissioner grant any such petition and authorize the Commissioner to charge the Deposit Account referenced above. Please credit any overpayments to this same Deposit Account.

Attorney No. HARD1.020DV1 (129843-1037)  
Customer No. 60148


AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL  
APPLICATION NO. 10/791,970

14

This is intended to be a complete response to the Office  
Action made final and mailed September 21, 2006.

Please direct all correspondence to the practitioner  
listed below at Customer No. 60148.

Respectfully submitted,



Monique A. Vander Molen  
Registration No. 53,716

Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP  
1601 Elm Street, Suite 3000  
Dallas, Texas 75201-4761  
Telephone: 214.999.4330  
Facsimile: 214.999.3623  
Email: ip@gardere.com

Dated: February 16, 2007